

[21st April 1964]

- (2) NOMINATION OF ONE MEMBER TO ASSOCIATE WITH THE COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE YEAR 1963-64.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I move—

‘ This House nominates the following one Member of the Council to associate with the Committee on Estimates of the Legislative Assembly for the year 1963-64 in the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term of office of Sri V. M. Surendra Ram with effect from the afternoon of 20th April 1964 :—

Sri C. Muthiah Pillai. ’

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is—

‘ This House nominates the following one Member of the Council to associate with the Committee on Estimates of the Legislative Assembly for the year 1963-64 in the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term of office of Sri V. M. Surendra Ram with effect from the afternoon of 20th April 1964 :—

Sri C. Muthiah Pillai. ’

The motion was put and carried.

VI.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

- (1) THE MADRAS BUILDINGS (LEASE AND RENT CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 17 OF 1964).

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I move—

‘ That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill,^a 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964) as passed by the Assembly be taken into consideration ’

Section 30 of the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1960 provides for exemption to certain categories of residential and non-residential buildings from the entire provisions of the Act. As the Members are aware, there were no such exemption provisions in the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1949 which was repealed and replaced by the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1960. The exemption provisions were introduced in the Act of 1960.

The idea was to relax gradually all controls in the matter of buildings and as the first step towards this, it was provided that all new buildings and all big buildings on monthly rents above Rs. 250 in the case of residential buildings and Rs. 400 in the

21st April 1964] [Srimathi Jothi Vencatachelum]

case of non-residential buildings should be exempted from the accommodation control as well as the rent and eviction control provisions. It was hoped that with the encouragement given to the construction of new buildings, the position in regard to the shortage of accommodation generally would ease.

But in the actual working of these exemption provisions, the Government found that the landlords of buildings which were exempted took undue advantage and demanded exorbitant rents from their tenants threatening them with summary ejection in case their demands were not conceded. Even poor tenants who were in occupation of small portions of big buildings were subject to these hardships because of the exemption available to the buildings as a whole though the portion in their occupation was small on a monthly rent below the limits prescribed in section 30.

The Government after examining the whole position introduced in the Legislative Assembly on 13th November 1961 a Bill by which it was proposed to take away the exemptions except in regard to the buildings constructed after 30th September 1960. But the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly to which the Bill was referred decided that the exemption should be on the basis of rent paid by the tenants and that the protection under the Act should not be extended to a tenant paying a monthly rent exceeding two hundred and fifty rupees in the case of a residential building or part thereof and four hundred rupees in the case of a non-residential building or part thereof. The principal Act was accordingly amended by the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Act, 1962 (Madras Act 2 of 1962).

Since then the Government have been receiving representations from the business community in general and the owners of catering establishments in particular, that, in view of the exemption from the rent and eviction control provisions of the Act now available to non-residential buildings or parts of non-residential buildings under their tenancy on monthly rents above Rs. 400 they are harassed by landlords and put to difficulties and troubles and also threatened with ejection from their business premises. The Government have examined the whole question again and have come to the conclusion that the exemption now available to non-residential buildings or parts of such buildings on monthly rents exceeding Rs. 400 should be withdrawn so that all non-residential buildings except those constructed after 30th September 1960 are brought within the purview of the Act and the tenants in occupation of such buildings protected under the Rent Control and eviction control provisions of the Act. The exemption available to residential buildings or parts of such buildings fetching monthly rents exceeding Rs. 250 will be continued. With this object, section 30 of the Act is proposed to be amended as provided for in the Bill. The Legislative Assembly passed the Bill on 31st March 1964. I hope that this House also will accept and pass the Bill.

[21st April 1964]

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Motion moved—

‘ That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration ’.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am aware that the Legislative Assembly has passed it, and we are a weak body and cannot change it. But there are some very important principles which, I think, the Government and also other hon. Members should take into consideration before they pass this Bill. You will remember, Sir, that in 1960 the Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah (fortunately he is present here now) who was in charge of the Bill said tersely, when he moved the Bill consolidating the earlier legislation, that all principles of rent control and de-control would be taken into consideration and finally the Bill would be passed. During the Select Committee stage, Sri C. Subramaniam suggested that in the case of residential buildings fetching a rent of over Rs. 250 and in the case of non-residential buildings fetching a rent of over Rs. 400, they were not anxious to disturb the freedom of contract. The principle of the rent control legislation was that the Government would not interfere unnecessarily with the freedom of contract except for the purpose of protecting people when the necessity arose. It is all right. In the case of residential buildings, it must be all right, because there are poor tenants paying high rents. We all agreed. But so far as non-residential buildings are concerned, the limit was fixed at Rs. 400. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam suggested during the consideration of the Bill at the Select Committee that they were not unnecessarily disturbing the freedom of contract between the parties and that the matter would be settled by the law of demand and supply. Therefore it is we adopted this limit of Rs. 400 at the Select Committee stage and the Bill was passed in 1960. In 1962 when certain minor provisions were amended, this provision relating to the limit of Rs. 400 was not amended. Therefore, there was nothing disturbing in 1962 according to Government. Otherwise, they would have brought forward this amending Bill then itself. It was not done. In 1964, the limit of Rs. 250 for residential buildings has not disturbed the freedom of contract between the parties. And so, the principle enunciated by Sri C. Subramaniam holds good and is accepted. Only in the case of non-residential buildings, there seem to have been representations from the business community. All right. Let us see what their representation is and what is the effect of their representation. This is a matter of contract between parties. The business community are not poor tenants. Persons who are prepared to pay over Rs. 400 as rent can never be called poor tenants. They must have business warranting a payment of Rs. 400 as rent. Otherwise, they would not have agreed to pay this Rs. 400 as rent. If we take away the limit and if the landlord wants to fix the rent at over Rs. 400, what can he do? The hon. Member Raja Muthiah Chettiar will bear with me, when I

21st April 1964] [Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar]

say, that the Indian Bank has its own difficulty of paying high rent. What do we do then? It is an essential service, banking service. But what do we do? We enter into a five-year contract with option on both sides. Therefore, within these five years, what will happen? The owners cannot merely threaten with eviction proceedings. Even if they threaten, why should the Legislature be threatened? I do not see any reason why the Legislature should be threatened. It is a contract between the parties and they will be guided by the terms of the contract. Some one in favour of the businessmen may come here and say, 'No, no; they will have written among themselves an agreement for a smaller amount.' But remember that it is for an amount over Rs. 400. Therefore, the tenant must have been prepared to pay over Rs. 400. What is the nature and use of the non-residential buildings? The Government must remember that. The Income-tax Department goes to the rescue of the tenant. Half of the rent is deducted for expenses. It is shown in the return and they are allowed to deduct it from the income. Therefore, I ask, how is trade and commerce affected. I cannot understand how the Government are seriously affected. I should say that this must be evidently a matter which must be regulated by contract between the parties and the Government must hesitate to interfere. This principle has been accepted earlier and it is on the basis of acceptance of this principle by the Government during the select committee meetings in 1960 and also by the Legislature later on, that this limit of Rs. 400 was fixed for non-residential buildings. The Government have accepted the principle that freedom of contract should not be interfered with also because they want that housing accommodation should progress and increase in our country and that we should not unnecessarily interfere. Therefore it is I say that if rents are fixed at over Rs. 400 in the case of non-residential buildings, they are exempted. They have adopted a well-known principle in rent control. This well-known principle was accepted in 1960 after great deliberation in the Select Committee and also in both the Houses. There can be no new justification for saying that somebody has made a representation and therefore, we should bring in this Bill. Because people make representations, we do not pass Bills here, unless without the necessary legislation the people are very seriously affected. How are the people seriously affected? It is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that it restricts trade and commerce. I say it cannot. There are people who can afford to pay Rs. 400 and more and they have entered into a contract for the purpose. When they enter into the contract, naturally according to our experience, there would be an agreement. The businessmen will not enter into agreements unnecessarily like other ordinary people occupying residential buildings, who sometimes make agreements month by month. Here we are dealing with businessmen. Business people are not people like many of us here. They always take care to see that the contract is laid out properly. Therefore, there can be no question of their being threatened with eviction.

[Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar] [21st April 1964]

I have seen this phrase 'threatening eviction' in the case of the Cultivating Tenants Protection Bill and in every other Bill relating to cultivating tenants. In their case there may be some justification. But I cannot see any justification for that phrase in the case of persons occupying non-residential buildings. There can be no justification for interference in the case of the business people. It is an interference with the freedom of contract. When the Government take away the exemption which has been granted by both the Houses of the Legislature, it must be for a better cause and a stronger cause than the one put forward.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: Sir, I rise to support all that Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar said against this Bill. I was a member of the Joint Select Committee which discussed this Bill threadbare in 1960. The Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah was there on the committee. We spent days and days over this Bill. We argued the matter and every part of the Bill was discussed threadbare. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam was also there. We did feel that the Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah understood the problem in all its aspects. I am not speaking for the poor businessman. We looked into his case, and therefore we fixed the limit of Rs. 400. A poor man paying a rent of over Rs. 400 per month and carrying on business, is an anomaly. We are speaking of the socialistic pattern of society. Are the Government going to protect those who are getting thousands of rupees and paying income-tax by saying that they cannot afford to pay Rs. 400? That there is rackrenting is a very familiar phrase used by the Government just to see that some people are benefited. In the proper case, I am all for benefiting them. But these people are not the people who stand in need of protection from the Government. Therefore, I think it is unfortunate that a Bill of this description should be brought in. The Amending Bill is an attempt to rob Peter to pay Paul. There is no case for thrusting protection on a class of people who are not starving. On the other hand, owners of buildings in urban areas have to pay property-tax and land-tax and may have to pay income-tax as well. Passing the Bill would do a grievous wrong to them and would go against the whole concept of justice and fairplay.

Of course, I shall certainly support the measure if it is to be sent to a Select Committee.

There is one other point. Whenever Bills of this nature are brought forward, we are kept in the dark as to the amount that will have to be spent on the heavy establishment that will have to be set up. When every business premises fetching a rent of over Rs. 400 comes under the purview of the Rent Control Act, has the Hon. Minister calculated the strength of the establishment that will have to be set up and what the charges are that will be incurred on the establishment? Instead of passing this Bill, more buildings may be constructed, multi-storeyed buildings may be

21st April 1964] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

put up in Mount Road which will accommodate the Rent Control office also. They will come up if the Hon. the Leader of the House gives his approval. But what is the object of bringing in this measure when there is no case whatsoever to give special treatment to a class of people who are by no means starved? I can understand the case of poor persons who carry on small trade being protected against eviction. What has happened to the traders now? Probably they will be paying a monthly rent of Rs. 200 or so. If it affects these people, then certainly we can think of helping them. But I am sorry to say that this Bill is a measure which is punitive in character.

DR. H. V. HANDE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while I welcome the idea of withdrawal of the limit in respect of non-residential buildings fetching a rent of more than Rs. 400, I fail to see why the limit of Rs. 250 in the case of private buildings is not withdrawn. In fact, I see there is a greater necessity in the case of private buildings for the withdrawal of the limit.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: There is no question of public and private buildings. Please say 'residential building'.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: This is his maiden speech. Let him not be interrupted.

DR. H. V. HANDE: In the case of a residential building which fetches a rent of Rs. 160, there is the possibility of temptation for the landlord to increase it to Rs. 250, just to escape from the clutches of the rent control authority. That is my point. The upper middle classes and the middle classes paying a rent of Rs. 160 will suddenly find that they have to pay more than Rs. 250. The owner of the building wants to escape from the clutches of the Rent Control Officer. This particular measure seeks to withdraw the limit of Rs. 400 in respect of non-residential buildings. The non-withdrawal of exemption in the case of residential buildings will result in spiralling up of prices indirectly. All our attempts to hold the priceline will be futile. This increases the cost of living for the lower and upper middle classes. Therefore I find the necessity to withdraw this exemption is much more in the case of residential buildings. Now that the Amending Bill has come up before the House for consideration, let me point out a couple of anomalies that are there in the proper administration of the measure. For instance, there are people who are suddenly transferred from one place to another. There are certain categories of people who are without houses. I would like to know whether the Government have got a code of priority for these houseless people and on what basis they are given first priority. When a person is suddenly transferred from one place to another, is there any provision for the superior officer to inform the Rent Control authority immediately that a particular person is transferred and, therefore, is without a house? In the case of sudden transfers, from whom should he seek remedy? I am

[Dr. H. V. Hande]

[21st April 1964]

asking a simple question before the House. We would like to know the code of priority adopted by the Government for the houseless people.

Let me make an appeal to the Hon. Minister that all complaints of commission and omission in the case of non-residential buildings will be looked into without fear or favour.

* SRI V. K. RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I was one of those who served on the Joint Select Committee on the Rent Control Bill when the Hon. Minister Sri V. Ramaiah was in charge of the Bill. The Bill was then gone into in detail and then only the exemption limit was fixed. After three years of the passing of this Act, the Government have now come forward with this Amending Bill. My submission is that people who are having very good business and are having tens of thousands of rupees as turnover will also have the benefit of this exemption. Why should they be exempted when they are making a huge profit and when they are in a position to pay Rs. 400 and more? I agree with Dr. Mudaliar that they do not need the protection of the Government. In case exemption is granted in those cases, we will find that the Government will stand to lose so far as income-tax is concerned. The Corporation of Madras also will stand to lose. Again, the cost of maintenance of these buildings has gone up considerably. Another point is that it curbs the enthusiasm of the landowners to build any more houses. My submission is that at least some exemption limit should be fixed. Instead of Rs. 400, why not raise the exemption limit? If that is not done, it will work great hardship on the landowners. On the whole, if the amendment is passed, it does not bear any relation to equity or justice.

8-00
p.m.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is a Bill intended to amend the original Act. As the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition rightly pointed out, in a democratic state, we must remove all the accommodation controls; when we are aiming at national integration, this legislation which is already in force and which we try to further amend, is going to create divisions among the people.

Sir, somehow or other property owners have come to be looked upon as sinners to-day, whether they be owners of a piece of land, a vacant site or ground, a small house or a small shop. These people are called landlords. One who does not own this type of property but owns a lot of cash and does a lot of business and earns huge profits, is considered to be a tenant and these are days for tenants and not for landlords as those poor people are called.

Now we have so many provisions in the Act. There is a clause which says that if the house had been constructed after 1960, it would not come under the provisions of the Act. Again if the rent of a residential building is over Rs. 250, it also will not come

21st April 1964]

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

under the purview of the Act. Tenants can do anything but the landlords are looked upon as people who always commit sins, who do not provide any amenities and who are always bent upon making money. Is this a correct attitude for the Government to take? Why should not the Government allow the problem to get itself solved by the operation of the law of supply and demand? Even in the report given by the Government proposing this amendment to the Act, Government have admitted that they have not been able to solve the housing problem. They have built so many houses. Wherever we go, within a radius of 20 miles of the City, we see buildings and houses coming up, we see brick and mortar and steel rolls in the streets. Yet in spite of this construction work progressing, the housing problem has not been solved.

Sir, the original Act was thought of as an emergency measure but still we continue it with a very big establishment to work it, and to mediate between the two classes of people, the tenants and the landlords. Is this necessary and are our landlords so unsympathetic as to extract money from their tenants? Are there not petty landlords solely depending on this income? Should they be deprived of this very just income for their subsistence which they ought to get according to the existing cost of living index? This amending Bill will cause considerable disadvantage to many though it may give some advantages to a few people. The right attitude on the part of the Government would be to study both sides of the question and see that the accommodation control is not there. This should be left to the sweet will and pleasure of the landlords and the tenants concerned. But the Government might say, once this Act is repealed, and there is no provision to control rents, then the landlords would pounce upon the tenants and increase the rents. After all, the rent should be regulated by the law of supply and demand. After all, there may be people ready to pay the rent. Why should the Government interfere in everything? That Government is the best which governs the least. Even in small affairs concerning the citizens, we are now regulating their conduct. That is why we see so much of annoyance is caused to the general public. As was rightly pointed out by the hon. Member Dr. Hande, if this Amending Bill is passed, there will be demand from people occupying residential buildings to take away the limit of Rs. 250 even in case of residential buildings. They would like to have the same advantage now proposed to be granted to those occupying non-residential buildings. There is no guarantee that Government would not get similar petitions from them also. We would like to know as the hon. (Member Dr. Hande pointed out, the reasons why Government have not included residential buildings also in this amending Bill. As the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, we should try to help poor people who live in houses fetching rents of Rs. 250 and below and not people who are in business and earn quite a good lot. As was rightly pointed out by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition people paying rent of Rs. 400 and over

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

[21st April 1964]

should be doing roaring business and earning good profits these days. What are the reasons that moved the Government to take a sympathetic view of the case of these people alone and not those in occupation of the residential buildings, must be made clear by the Government.

திரு. எம். சுப்பையா செட்டியார் : கனம் உபதலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்த Rent Control Amendment Bill விஷயமாக சில வார்த்தைகள் பேச விரும்புகிறேன். இப்போது அரசாங்கம் தொடட்டதற்கு எல்லாம் Control கொண்டுவருவது போல் இந்த 1960-ம் வருஷ Rent Control. சட்டத்திலும் Control கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படியே புதிதுபுதிதாக கண்ட்ரோல்களைக் கொண்டுவர அரசாங்கம் விரும்புவதாகத் தெரிகிறது. வியாபாரிகளுக்கு—400 ரூபாய் வாடகை கொடுக்கிறவர்களுக்கு பல தொந்தரவுகள் இருக்கின்றன. அந்த மாதிரி தொந்தரவு பட்டதைச் சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்ற வகையில் இந்தச் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்த வேண்டும் என்று கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள்.

பொதுவாக பல காரியங்கள் நடக்கும்போது சில தொந்தரவுகள் ஏற்படத்தான் செய்யும். சில தொந்தரவுகளுக்காக அரசாங்கம் அதை மாற்றக் கூடாது. உதாரணமாக பலபேர் வாடகையை வைத்துக் கொண்டுதான் ஜீவனம் நடத்தி வருகிறார்கள். ரூ. 400-க்கு மேல் ஒரு வியாபாரி வாடகை கொடுக்கக் கூடிய நிலையில் இருக்கும்போது அந்த வீட்டுக்காரர் வியாபாரியிடம் விரோதமாக இருக்கமாட்டார். அவர்களும் தப்புத்தண்டாவுக்குப் போகமாட்டார்கள். அந்த வியாபாரிகளும் பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக ஒரே கட்டிடத்தில் இருந்து தான் வியாபாரம் செய்கிறார்கள். ஆயிரத்தில் ஒருவர்தான் இடைஞ்சல் செய்வார். இதைக் காரணமாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு ரூ. 400-க்கு மேல் ஏற்றக்கூடாது என்று சொல்வது தவறு. விலைவாசி எப்படி ஏறிக்கொண்டே போகிறது என்று தெரியும். 1960-க்கு முன் இருந்த அதே வாடகையை வைத்து இருக்க வேண்டும் என்று கேட்பது நியாயம் இல்லை. இதை அரசாங்கம் உணர வேண்டும்.

எனக்கு ஒரு சந்தேகம் வருகிறது. ஆளும் கட்சியினர் வியாபாரிகளிடமிருந்து donation வாங்குவதற்காக, வியாபாரிகளுக்காக இந்த நன்மையைச் செய்கிறார்களோ என்று சந்தேகப்படுகிறேன். நான் உறுதியாக சொல்வதற்கில்லை. இந்த மாதிரியான காரியங்களுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்கக்கூடாது. குடியிருப்பவர்களுக்கு விலக்கு கொடுத்தால்கூட நியாயமாக இருக்கும். அந்த மாதிரி குடித்தனம் இருப்பவர்களுக்கு விலக்கு இல்லாமல், வியாபாரிகளுக்குமட்டும் போடுவது சரியில்லை. வியாபாரத்தில் இருப்பவர்கள் இந்த விவகாரத்திற்குப் போகமாட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் கூடுமானவரை, வீட்டுக்காரர்களின் நல்லெண்ணத்தை வைத்துக் கொண்டுதான் காரியம் செய்கிறார்கள். அப்படி இருக்கும் போது அரசாங்கம் தொடட்டதற்கு எல்லாம் Control கொண்டுவரக் கூடாது. அரசாங்கத்தின் தயவை மக்கள் எதற்கும் எதிர்பார்க்க

21st April 1964] [திரு. எம். சுப்பையா செட்டியார்]

வேண்டும் என்று இருப்பதை எடுக்க வேண்டும். இப்படி புதிதாக Control கொண்டுவருவதைவிட இருக்கிற Control களை எடுக்க அரசாங்கம் ஆவன செய்யவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members for their criticisms and for their suggestions. The hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that Government once decided to do away with this control. Finding the difficulties of the people, particularly the Government servants, in getting proper accommodation, certain provisions were enacted under the Act of 1960 with a certain amount of relaxation of control. Though it was the idea of the Government to gradually relax control, as a first step towards that, it was decided that all new buildings put up after 30th September 1960 could be completely exempted from the purview of the Act and we also fixed a limit of Rs. 250 in respect of residential buildings and Rs. 450 in respect of non-residential buildings that would come under the scope of the Act. In the actual working of the Act we found that while a number of new residential buildings had come up, no new non-residential building had come up after the enactment of the Act. Apart from that, most of the business concerns, we found, were located in rented buildings. It will be perfectly all right if the landlords enhance the rent up to a certain limit. But we find that the rent is enhanced twice and even three times four hundred rupees. These buildings could not be brought under the purview of the Act.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : They accepted it. 3-10
p.m.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : But the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not know the number of suits filed in the Civil Courts.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : I would like to know the number of suits filed.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : Not only that. Even in spite of the fact that the tenants were willing to pay enhanced rents, they were threatened and harassed with eviction proceedings. For this reason, the Government have brought forward this Bill. It is the duty of the Government to protect not only the business community but also people occupying residential buildings. But in the case of residential buildings, only a few representations were received by the Government and they were considered by the Government. But as a very large number of businessmen have made representations to the Government and since their cases were pending in the Court, the Government thought it right to interfere. Whatever be the agreement between the landlord and the tenant, the Government are not aware of. But only when it came to a question of harassment of the tenants by the landlords, the Government thought they should come forward with this legislation. There is no difficulty in the case of

[Srimathi Jothi Vencatachellum] [21st April 1964]

residential buildings. As the hon. Member Dr. Hande pointed out, residential buildings also fetching a rent of more than Rs. 250, should be brought within the purview of the Act. But, new residential buildings have come up in sufficient numbers after 1960. In the case of non-residential buildings, not many new buildings have come up. The catering establishments have to continue in the same old rented buildings. We have to protect the interests of the catering establishments.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Hotel people are those who make lot of money.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : The landlords have got the right to enhance the rent, but I do not think it will be correct for any landlord to evict the tenants after having taken them as tenants for a number of years. This will not only affect their business but also their very life itself. Considering all these things, it is necessary to bring forward this Bill. Sir, the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that the Hon. Sri V. Ramaiah who was the Chairman of the Joint Select Committee and also the Member in charge of this Bill in 1960, was very reasonable. I may say, Sir, that I am also very reasonable. (Laughter). I do not think there should be any controversy over this simple Bill, though it might affect certain landlords. I request the House to accept the Bill.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is—

“That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and declared carried.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : I demand a poll.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is customary in this House to call the names of Members block by block to stand in their places. Since seats have not yet been allotted, and as this is the first day of the meeting after the biennial elections, those in favour of the Motion and those against the Motion may be asked to stand in their places, and then a count taken.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Those who are for the motion will stand in their places first and those against next, and then the neutral.

Twenty-four Members stood in favour of the motion, eleven against, and two neutral.

The motion was carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

21st April 1964] [Deputy Chairman]

Clauses 2 and 3 were put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM: Sir, I move—

“ That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.”

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved—

“ That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.”

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: Sir, I hope the Deputy Chairman will appeal to the Hon. Minister not to bring in another Bill covering residential buildings. Representations should be carefully looked into and merely because there are representations we should not take action.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: Sir, it is stated that representations have been received by the Government. I ask for those representations to be placed on the table of the House so that the Members may look into them and see what sort of people have made representations and what their object in making the representations is. This Act was expected to be extinct by this time. But it is being given life year after year. I hope this House will be given an opportunity to go into all the matters connected with this Bill. We are not unreasonable people. We have supported the Government in many a measure. We will support them here also, if there is any need for this.

DR. H. V. HANDE: I hope the Hon. Minister will give sympathetic consideration to the representations of those interested in the rents of residential buildings.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is—

“ That the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 17 of 1964), as passed by the Assembly, be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

(2) THE LAND IMPROVEMENT LOANS (MADRAS AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1964 (L.A. BILL NO. 8 OF 1964).

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH: Mr. Chairman. Sir, I move—

“ That the Land Improvement Loans (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1964), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.”